



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/396,470	09/15/1999	EUEE-SEON JANG	030681-152	7479

21839 7590 07/29/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

SENGI, BEHROOZ M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/396,470

Applicant(s)

JANG ET AL.

Examiner

Behrooz Senfi

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on May 19, 2003 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Bajaj et al. (US 6,438,266) reference.

Applicant's amends claim 1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 20 and canceled claims 8 and 17.

Response to remarks:

Regarding claim 9, regarding the removal of redundant data (paper no.13, page 5 of remarks).

Examiner answer; in the process of data compression and decompression, the redundant information being removed before transmission (to save bandwidth) and in the decoding side the data, in which the redundant information has been already removed will be reconstructed, which is the same as applicant definition (page 4, lines 19 – 20 of specification).

Bajaj 266 encoding/decoding also is a hierarchy process of layers, in which in the process of encoding/decoding the redundant information is being removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bajaj et al. (US 6,438,266).

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Bajaja '266 discloses the claimed limitation "progressive 3-D mesh information coding" (i.e. fig. 10), and the claimed limitation "dividing a 3-D mesh into a plurality of mesh components, wherein each of the mesh components corresponds to a different partition of the 3-D mesh" (i.e. fig. 3a – 3c), and the claimed limitation "coding each of the plurality of mesh components, wherein the plurality of coded mesh components are capable of being decoded and incrementally reproduced as unit mesh parts of the 3-D mesh" (i.e. figs. 1 and 10, col. 3, lines 60+ and col. 6, lines 20 - 30) where discloses incremental encoding and transmission to decoder, and the decoder would decode the information as received incrementally, and the claimed limitation "multiplexing the plurality of code mesh components into a compressed bit stream and transmitting the compressed bit stream" reads on (i.e. fig. 10, combine Encoding), and the claimed limitation (claim 2) "wherein each of the plurality of mesh components includes at least connectivity information, geometry information and photometry information which are necessary to reconstruct the coded mesh component" reads on (i.e. fig. 31, abstract lines 4 – 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3 – 7, 9 – 16 and 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bajaj '266.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Bajaj '266 teaches decomposing the bit streams into contours and dividing contours into plurality of mesh component, wherein the plurality of mesh components are capable of being incrementally reproduced as unit mesh parts of the 3-D mesh" (i.e. figs. 1, 3a – 3c and 10, col. 3, lines 60+ and col. 6, lines 20 - 30), and the decoding process in claim 5 is reversible process of the encoder (see fig. 1, 14, and 18). Therefore, one skilled in the art would use the decoder (18) to decode the transmitted encoded 3-d image (see the encoding process (14) of fig. 1) to display (19). Compositing the decoded image must be done by the decoder (18 of fig. 1, col. 1, lines 55+), which the decoded image has been reconstructed (synthesizing) for display (19), and the extracting mesh layers from 3-d mesh (see layers of 0 – 3 of fig. 3a – 3b).

Regarding claim 3, the limitation as claimed "extracting one or more mesh" and "dividing the one or more mesh" has been explained in the above rejection with respect to claims 5, 10, 15.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 7, 14, and 16, in the coding/decoding process, reusing the (coded) information to speed up the process of (compression) coding/decoding, would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

Regarding claims 9, 11, 12, 18, and 20, as for "extracting mesh object layers", the limitation as claimed is substantially similar to claim 10, and has been discussed (see the above explanation with regards to claim 10), and as for "independently coding and transmitting", Bajaj '266 teaches compression and encoding and transmitting (see 14 and 15 of fig. 1 and also fig. 10), and the "decoding and reconstructing" (see 18, of fig. 1) and as for "removing the redundant information", would have been obvious to one skilled in the art since removing the

Art Unit: 2613

redundant information is one of the means primarily used for compressing data, and “a 3-d data analyzer for receiving a 3-d mesh” the functionality of “analyzer” as recited in the claim, for dividing a 3-d mesh into one or more independent mesh layers is similar to receiving the 3-d mesh and decomposing into one or more contours (see fig. 3a and 10), and the limitation claimed “incrementally reproducing mesh parts” has been discussed above.

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Bajaj '266 teaches 3-d mesh information coding/decoding as discussed above, and as for “one or more mesh object layer coders” and “one or more mesh object layer decoders” (see abstract, lines 2+, fig. 1, 14 and 18, and also figs. 10, and 32), and the claimed “a 3-d mesh analyzer for receiving a 3-d mesh and dividing an input 3-d mesh into one or more mesh object layers”, the functionality of “analyzer” as recited in the claim, for dividing a 3-d mesh into one or more independent mesh layers is similar to receiving the 3-d mesh and decomposing into one or more contours (see fig. 3a and 10) and the newly added limitation in claim 19, “wherein each of the plurality of coded mesh components include information necessary such that, when decoded, is capable of being rendered as a unit mesh part of the 3-D mesh” reads on connectivity information as cited in claim 2, and has been discussed.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2613

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Behrooz Senfi** whose telephone number is **(703)305-0132**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Chris Kelley** can be reached on **(703)305-4856**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relative to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

B. S. B. S.

7/24/2003


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600